

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.ispto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/684,470	10/15/2003	Mitsutoshi Hasegawa	03560.003370	4691	
5514 7.	590 04/07/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			JOHNSON, JO	JOHNSON, JONATHAN J	
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1725		

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	,	
	10/684,470	HASEGAWA ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Jonathan Johnson	1725		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 16(a). In no event, however, may a re till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT cause the application to become AB/	ATION. ply be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. INDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Ja	nuary 2006.	1		
_	action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ice except for formal matte	rs, prosecution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,6,7,10-17 and 20-20	6 is/are withdrawn from co	nsideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•			
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) <u>1,3-5,8,9,18,19,27-29</u> is/are objected				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•.	:		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b)□ objected to b	y the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyand	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s	i) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No				
Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been i	eceived in this National Stage		
application from the International Bureau	,			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not r	eceived.		
		;		
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		immary (PTO-413)		
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 		/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	_·		

Application/Control Number: 10/684,470

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1,3-5,8-9,18-19, 27, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants' invention involves a "novel bonding method which can realize highly reliable bonding between members (see paragraph 16). Applicants' specification, however, does not explain the composition or materials necessary to arrive at their novel bonding method. Claims 1, 3, and 27 recite "a first member," which corresponds to a support frame (paragraph 165). While applicants' explain the composition and structure of each of the claimed components (i.e., second member at paragraph 100; underlayer at paragraph 104; glass frit at paragraph 162), applicants do not explain the composition and structure of the support frame. Because the specification does not in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention, a rejection is required under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The claimed invention as a whole may not be adequately described if the claims require an essential or critical feature. It is the examiner's position that since Applicant's invention involves forming a bond between

Application/Control Number: 10/684,470

Art Unit: 1725

members having a specific composition and that the members are claimed, the claimed members are not adequately described in the specification.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's MPEP citations are directed to rejections made under enablement, not written description. The written description requirement has several policy objectives. "[T]he essential goal' of the description of the invention requirement is to clearly convey the information that an applicant has invented the subject matter which is claimed." In re Barker, 559 F.2d 588, 592 n.4, 194 USPQ 470, 473 n.4 (CCPA 1977). Another objective is to put the public in possession of what the applicant claims as the invention. See Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly, 119 F.3d 1559, 1566, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1997), cert. denied, 523 U.S. 1089 (1998).

Applicant argues the claimed "first member" is enabled. The examiner agrees. Applicant goes on to argue that the claim limitation satisfies the written description requirement. The examiner disagrees. The written description requirement is separate and distinct from the enablement requirement. In re Barker, 559 F.2d 588, 194 USPQ 470 (CCPA 1977), cert. denied, 434 U.S. 1064 (1978); Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d 1555, 1562, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1115 (Fed. Cir. 1991). A lack of adequate written description issue arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process. See, e.g., Fujikawa v. Wattanasin, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996). In the instant case, it is the examiner's position that applicants have not adequately described the claimed "first member" for the broadly claimed

Application/Control Number: 10/684,470

Art Unit: 1725

"airtight container." This airtight container could be anything. Applicant even admits that the support frame could be "glass" or other "conventional material" for their patent application for forming an airtight container (see page 3, first full paragraph of the paper dated 1-20-06). This "laundry list" does not constitute a written description because it would not "reasonably lead" those skilled in the art to any particular species. <u>In re Ruschig</u>, 379 F.2d 990, 995, 154 USPQ 118, 123 (CCPA 1967).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Johnson whose telephone number is 571-272-1177. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 AM-5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 1725

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pat Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jonathan Johnson Primary Examiner Art Unit 1725